

Response

Applicant: Niranjan Damera-Venkata et al.

Serial No.: 10/750,591

Filed: December 31, 2003

Docket No.: 200315400-1

Title: DISPLAYING SPATIALLY OFFSET SUBFRAMES WITH A DISPLAY DEVICE HAVING A SET OF DEFECTIVE DISPLAY PIXELS

REMARKS

This is responsive to the Non-Final Office Action mailed June 5, 2007. In that Office Action, claims 1-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lubin et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,075,884 ("Lubin") in view of Conner et al., U.S. Publication No. 2005/0225732 ("Conner").

With this Response, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-32, and requests reconsideration of these claims. Claims 1-32 remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 1-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lubin et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,075,884 ("Lubin") in view of Conner et al., U.S. Publication No. 2005/0225732 ("Conner").

Independent claim 1 recites "selecting a first position and a second position spatially offset from the first position, the first and the second positions selected based on positions of the defective display pixels and characteristics of a human visual system". The Examiner acknowledged that Lubin fails to disclose numerous limitations of claim 1, including the above-quoted limitation. (See, e.g., Office Action at para. no. 4, page 3). The Examiner stated that Conner teaches "selecting a first position and a second position spatially offset from the first position (page 2, paragraph 27, page 3, paragraph 30, pages 4,5, paragraphs 52,53), the first and the second positions selected based on positions of the defective display pixels and characteristics of a human visual system (page 3, paragraphs 41,31-37)". (Office Action at para. no. 4, page 3). Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited portions of Conner indicate that the system shifts between multiple positions, but there is no disclosure in the cited portions of Conner regarding how the positions are selected. More specifically, the cited portions of Conner do not teach or suggest selecting positions "based on" positions of defective display pixels and characteristics of a human visual system.

In view of the above, the cited references do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and requests allowance of this claim. Since dependent

Response

Applicant: Niranjan Damera-Venkata et al.

Serial No.: 10/750,591

Filed: December 31, 2003

Docket No.: 200315400-1

Title: DISPLAYING SPATIALLY OFFSET SUBFRAMES WITH A DISPLAY DEVICE HAVING A SET OF DEFECTIVE DISPLAY PIXELS

claims 2-10 further limit patentably distinct claim 1, and are further distinguishable over the cited references, claims 2-10 are believed to be allowable over the cited references. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and allowance of these claims, are respectfully requested.

Independent claim 11 recites "wherein the first position and the second position are identified based on positions of the defective display pixels and spatio-temporal characteristics of a human visual system." The Examiner acknowledged that Lubin fails to disclose numerous limitations of claim 11, including the above-quoted limitation. (See, e.g., Office Action at para. no. 4, page 7). The Examiner stated that Conner teaches "the first and the second positions selected based on positions of the defective display pixels and characteristics of a human visual system (page 3, paragraph 41)". (Office Action at para. no. 4, page 7). Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited portions of Conner indicate that the system shifts between multiple positions, but there is no disclosure in the cited portions of Conner regarding how the positions are identified. More specifically, the cited portions of Conner do not teach or suggest identifying positions "based on" positions of defective display pixels and spatio-temporal characteristics of a human visual system.

In view of the above, the cited references do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claim 11. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and requests allowance of this claim. Since dependent claims 12-20 further limit patentably distinct claim 11, and are further distinguishable over the cited references, claims 12-20 are believed to be allowable over the cited references. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and allowance of these claims, are respectfully requested.

Independent claim 21 recites "means for identifying the sequence of spatially offset positions based on a position of the defective display pixel and characteristics of a human visual system to minimize an impact of the defective display pixel on the human visual system." The Examiner acknowledged that Lubin fails to disclose numerous limitations of claim 21, including the above-quoted limitation. (See, e.g., Office Action at para. no. 4, page 11). The Examiner stated that Conner teaches "means for identifying the sequence of spatially offset positions based on a position of the defective display pixel and characteristics

Response

Applicant: Niranjan Damera-Venkata et al.

Serial No.: 10/750,591.

Filed: December 31, 2003

Docket No.: 200315400-1

Title: DISPLAYING SPATIALLY OFFSET SUBFRAMES WITH A DISPLAY DEVICE HAVING A SET OF DEFECTIVE DISPLAY PIXELS

of a human visual system to minimize an impact of the defective display pixel on the human visual system (page 1, paragraph 6, page 2, paragraph 24, page 3, paragraphs 30-37, 41, 42, pages 4, 5, paragraphs 52, 53)". (Office Action at para. no. 4, page 12). Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited portions of Conner indicate that the system shifts between multiple positions, but there is no disclosure in the cited portions of Conner regarding how the positions are identified. More specifically, the cited portions of Conner do not teach or suggest identifying positions "based on" a position of a defective display pixel and characteristics of a human visual system.

In view of the above, the cited references do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claim 21. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and requests allowance of this claim. Since dependent claims 22-27 further limit patentably distinct claim 21, and are further distinguishable over the cited references, claims 22-27 are believed to be allowable over the cited references. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 22-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and allowance of these claims, are respectfully requested.

Independent claim 28 recites "identifying a plurality of different combinations of the display positions; and analyzing each of the combinations to identify a combination of display positions that minimizes an effect of defective display pixels of the display device on a human visual system." The Examiner acknowledged that Lubin fails to disclose numerous limitations of claim 28, including the above-quoted limitations. (See, e.g., Office Action at para. no. 4, page 14). The Examiner stated that Conner teaches "identifying a plurality of different combinations of the display positions; and analyzing each of the combinations to identify a combination of display positions that minimizes an effect of defective display pixels of the display device on a human visual system (pages 2, 3, paragraphs 23-36, pages 3, 4, paragraphs 40, 41, page 2, paragraphs 26-28, page 1, paragraphs 7, 8)". (Office Action at para. no. 4, page 15). Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited portions of Conner indicate that the system shifts between multiple positions. However, the cited portions of Conner do not teach or suggest analyzing a plurality of different combinations of display positions to identify a combination that minimizes an effect of defective display pixels on a human visual system.

Response

Applicant: Niranjan Damera-Venkata et al.

Serial No.: 10/750,591

Filed: December 31, 2003

Docket No.: 200315400-1

Title: DISPLAYING SPATIALLY OFFSET SUBFRAMES WITH A DISPLAY DEVICE HAVING A SET OF DEFECTIVE DISPLAY PIXELS

In view of the above, the cited references do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claim 28. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and requests allowance of this claim. Since dependent claims 29-32 further limit patentably distinct claim 28, and are further distinguishable over the cited references, claims 29-32 are believed to be allowable over the cited references. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 29-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and allowance of these claims, are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-32 are in form for allowance and are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-32 is respectfully requested.

No fees are required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16(h)(i). However, if such fees are required, the Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's representative at the below-listed telephone numbers to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Any inquiry regarding this Response should be directed to either Jeff A. Holmen at Telephone No. (612) 573-0178, Facsimile No. (612) 573-2005 or Eileen Lehmann at Telephone No. (650) 857-7940, Facsimile No. (650) 852-6063. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Response

Applicant: Niranjan Damera-Venkata et al.

Serial No.: 10/750,591

Filed: December 31, 2003

Docket No.: 200315400-1

Title: DISPLAYING SPATIALLY OFFSET SUBFRAMES WITH A DISPLAY DEVICE HAVING A SET OF DEFECTIVE DISPLAY PIXELS

IP Administration
Legal Department, M/S 35
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

Niranjan Damera-Venkata et al.

By their attorneys,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC
Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250
100 South Fifth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 573-0178
Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: 9/5/07

JAH:jms


Jeff A. Holmen

Reg. No. 38,492

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8:

The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, are being transmitted via facsimile to
Fax No. (571) 273-8300 on this 5th day of September, 2007.

By: 

Name: Jeff A. Holmen